

Even in the first decade of the 21st century, BLANCHE is the owner of many “firsts.” Even though we don’t like to admit it, and we are reluctant to talk about it, there is a double standard in politics for women. There just is. I am proud to serve with the largest number of women this Senate has ever seen, and that goes double for my 8 years with Senator BLANCHE LINCOLN.

Let me say a brief word about her family. Her husband Steve is an old friend of mine. We trace our roots back to Little Rock Central High School and the University of Arkansas. The Lord has blessed BLANCHE and Steve with two bright, energetic, athletic, and even sometimes well-behaved sons—and they are great—who are currently freshmen at Yorktown High School in Arlington. They bring their parents much joy. They are also extremely proud of their mother. I have seen firsthand what a wonderful mother she has been and is. I stand in awe.

In fact, BLANCHE is not only a good Senator and a good mother and a good wife—she is much more. She is a good daughter to her mother, who basically runs Phillips County, AK. She is a good sister in her very large family. She is a good member of her community, helping friends, neighbors, and those in need. BLANCHE is very faithful in her relationship with God, which has given her strength and kept her grounded in good times and in bad. She follows the Golden Rule and puts her faith into action every single day. Simply put, she is a good person.

Lastly, BLANCHE is a good boss. She has drawn to her a very talented and hard-working staff in Washington, DC, and in Arkansas. I know they will always be proud to tell people they worked for Senator BLANCHE LINCOLN.

Before I get carried away, there is one minor matter that I believe I need to address. On occasion—rarely, but every so often—BLANCHE runs a little late. I know many of you are shocked to hear this. Let me tell you why that is. It is because people love BLANCHE and BLANCHE loves people, and she is never too busy to stop, to notice, and to listen. She is never too busy to talk to the Capitol Police or to the janitor here or to that family from Idaho who can’t figure out the Dirksen building. She takes time for people. And that is one of her attributes that makes her so special, because those people are as important to her as the most powerful Members of the Congress. That is what makes BLANCHE special.

It is hard to find just one word to describe Senator LINCOLN—kind, smart, fearless, persistent, knowledgeable, no nonsense, and I could go on. But the one word I would like to focus on today is friend. There are 99 Senators today who consider her a friend. They like her, they like working with her, and they respect her. I have had many Republicans and Democrats say how much they hate to see her leave because she makes this place better.

There is a passage in the Bible that says: “Well done, thou good and faith-

ful servant.” This applies to BLANCHE, but not only to the job that she has done here in Senate. It applies to her as a person. There is a lot more to BLANCHE than just being a Senator. In January, she starts a new chapter. And as much as she will be missed around here, we all have confidence there are many more great things to come.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). Under the previous order, there will be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes each.

The Senator from Indiana.

NEW START TREATY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the new START treaty. We undertake this debate at a time when almost 100,000 American military personnel are fighting a difficult war in Afghanistan. More than 1,300 of our troops have been killed in Afghanistan, with almost 10,000 wounded.

Meanwhile, we are in our seventh year in Iraq—a deployment that has cost more than 4,400 American lives and wounded roughly 32,000 persons. We still have more than 47,000 troops deployed in that country. Tensions on the Korean peninsula are extremely high, with no resolution to the problems in North Korea’s nuclear program. We continue to pursue international support for steps that could prevent Iran’s nuclear program from producing a nuclear weapon. We remain concerned about stability in Pakistan and the security of that country’s nuclear arsenal. We are attempting to counter terrorist threats emanating from Afghanistan, Pakistan, east Africa, Yemen, and many other locations. We are concerned about terrorist cells in allied countries, and even in the United States. We remain highly vulnerable to disruptions in oil supplies due to national disasters, terrorist attacks, political instability, or manipulation of the markets by unfriendly oil-producing nations.

Even as we attempt to respond to these and other national security imperatives, we are facing severe resource constraints. Since September 11, 2001, we have spent almost \$1.1 trillion in Iraq and Afghanistan. We are spending roughly twice as many dollars on defense today as we were before 9/11. These heavy defense burdens have occurred in the context of a financial and budgetary crisis that has raised the U.S. Government’s total debt to almost \$14 trillion. The fiscal year 2010 budget deficit registered about \$1.3 trillion, or 9 percent of GDP.

All Senators here are familiar with the challenges I have just enumerated. But as we begin this debate, we should keep this larger national security con-

text firmly in mind. As we contend with the enormous security challenges of the 21st century, the last thing we need to is to reject a process that has mitigated the threat posed by Russia’s nuclear arsenal.

For 15 years, the START treaty has helped us to keep a lid on the U.S.-Russian nuclear rivalry. It established a working relationship on nuclear arms with a country that was our mortal enemy for 4½ decades. START’s transparency features assured both countries about the nuclear capabilities of the other. For us, that meant having American experts on the ground in Russia conducting inspections of nuclear weaponry.

Because START expired on December 5, 2009, we have had no American inspectors in Russia for more than a year. New START will enable American teams to return to Russia to collect data on the Russian arsenal and verify Russian compliance. These inspections greatly reduce the possibility that we will be surprised by Russian nuclear deployments or advancements.

Before we even get to the text of the new START treaty and the resolution of ratification, Members should recognize what a Senate rejection of new START would mean for our broader national security. Failure of the Senate to approve the treaty would result in an expansion of arms competition with Russia. It would guarantee a reduction in transparency and confidence-building procedures, and it would diminish between cooperation and Russian defense establishments. It would complicate our military planning.

A rejection of new START would be greeted with delight in Iran, North Korea, Syria, and Burma. These nations want to shield their weapons programs from outside scrutiny and they want to be able to acquire sensitive weapons technologies. They want to block international efforts to make them comply with their legal obligations. Rogue nations fear any nuclear cooperation between the United States and Russia because they know it limits their options. They want to call into question our own nonproliferation credentials and they want Russia to resist tough economic measures against them.

If we reject this treaty, it will be harder to get Russia’s cooperation in stopping nuclear proliferation. It could create obstacles on some issues in the United Nations Security Council, where Russia has a veto. It might also reduce incentives for Russia to cooperate in providing supply routes for our troops in Afghanistan. It would give more weight to the arguments of Russian nationalists who seek to undermine cooperation with the United States and its allies. It would require additional satellite coverage of Russia at the expense of their use against terrorists.

With all that we need to achieve, why would we add to our problems by separating ourselves from Russia over a